

Appl. No. 10/825,919
Amdt. Dated July 8, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2009

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has modified each of the independent claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Specifically, by this amendment, Applicant has modified each of the independent claims consistent with the Examiner's suggestion to specifically recite that the electrolytic solution is dropped to the opened end portion of the electrolytic solution containing vessel. Applicant further notes that the claims now clearly recite that the vessel into which the electrolytic solution has been dropped is mounted on a turntable and centrifugal force is generated by rotation of the turntable in order to inject the electrolytic solution into the device.

Applicant respectfully submits that these modifications clearly overcome the Examiner's rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In regard to the Examiner's objection to claim 12 under 37 CFR § 1.75, Applicant has canceled claims 12 and 13. Therefore, Applicant submits that the objection to claim 12 is now moot.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest

Appl. No. 10/825,919
Amdt. Dated July 8, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2009

Applicants presently claimed invention as now specified.

More specifically, by this amendment, Applicant has modified each of the independent claims to specifically require:

dropping electrolytic solution to an open end portion of an electrolytic solution container, wherein the opening into which the electrolytic solution is dropped extends across one side of the electrolytic solution container;

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references of record teach or suggest a system and/or method for manufacturing a device of the present invention wherein the electrolytic solution is dropped to an opened end portion of an electrolytic solution container and wherein the opening extends across one side of the electrolytic solution container.

Advantageously, by this arrangement, Applicant's electrolytic solution container manufacturing process is much more efficient because the electrolytic solution can be dropped across a greater range of locations for the container and the container can be filled more rapidly in light of the larger opening. Furthermore, sealing of the container is a relatively straightforward task because the cover need only be applied to a single side of the solution container.

In contrast with prior art, it is not necessary to form multiple openings in one or more sides of the electrolytic solution container. Rather, one side of the container is simply left open and this side of the container is only sealed after the electrolytic solution has been dropped into and distributed within

Appl. No. 10/825,919
Amdt. Dated July 8, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2009

the electrolytic solution container.

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest this advance in the art. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

7/14/09

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS, LLC.
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5450
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (312) 277-2006
Attorney for Applicants